Land Speculation Endangers the Economy

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By FRANK CHODOROV

THERE IS A SCHOOL of economists who hold that depressions (or "hard times," as they used to be called) result from speculation in land values. This, in brief, is the way their theory runs:

All economic goods, including services, come from the application of labor and capital to raw materials; there is no other way to produce the things men live by. Labor is abundant, capital can be accumulated, but land is a fixed quantity; there is no way for man to create mines, to manufacture farm lands, to fabricate a new world. Land is what it always was, and always will be.

All production starts with land, and as production increases the demand for land increases. This causes the value of the more desirable sites to rise. Anticipating a further increase in production, and therefore a greater need for land, owners are prone to keep their holdings out of use in expectation of receiving higher prices. This is speculation. Land becomes something to gamble with, not to use. Builders have to pay more and more for the privilege of erecting houses on city sites; farmers need more and more capital to acquire agricultural lands, and the rising price of mineral lands shows up in the prices of commodities the consumer uses.

Eventually, the cost of land becomes prohibitive; there is little left for labor and capital to compensate them for their effort in production. At that point, labor and capital lay down on the job and production declines. A depression is nothing but a stoppage of production. When production comes to a halt, the demand for land decreases and so does the price. The speculative value of land is squeezed out (that is, the last speculator loses his paper profits). When the price of land comes down to its normal level, production starts in again. That is, the theory holds, the only way out of the depression.

There is support for this theory in the known fact that depressions are felt in the extractive industries long before they hit the commercial and manufacturing centers. Let us take, as an instance, the depression of the 1930's. During World War I, the prices of farm products, due to the great demand, rose to phenomenal heights—so much so that the government saw fit to put a top price on certain commodities. To cash in on this demand, farmers acquired additional land at ridiculously high prices, which, of course, meant burdening themselves with big mortgages.

When the war was over, the demand for agricultural products declined and so did the prices. As a result, the farmers' income dropped to a point where they could not meet the payments due on their mortgages and foreclosures resulted. This began about 1923, years before the depression came to the cities. Mines began shutting down at about the same time. We never got out of the depression, these theorists hold, because the infusion of money into the economy by the Roosevelt Administration tended to hold up the speculative values of land and thus retarded the resumption of production.

THIS THEORY comes to mind now because of a warning raised in the August issue of *House and Home*, a Henry R. Luce publication devoted to the building trade. The entire issue is devoted to a discussion of the land question. In one of its articles it says:

"Many of America's biggest panics and depressions were touched off by over-speculation in land and a bust in land values that carried hundreds of banks and other lending institutions down with it.

"The panic of 1836 came with the collapse of the land boom along the new canals. The panic of 1857 came with the collapse of the land boom along the new railroads; so did the panic of 1873. And the 80% drop in land prices that started in the late Twenties played a bigger part in the bank failures of 1932 and 1933 than did the 89% fall in the prices of stocks from the 1929 peak.

"A land bust in the Sixties could be even more serious if nothing is done to check the inflation, because this land boom is blowing up to such monstrous size. Paper prices for land now total half a trillion dollars—nearly twice the size of the national debt, more than six times the federal tax revenues, nearly twice today's price of all listed stocks, more than twice the resources of all our commercial banks.

"If this bubble can be deflated quickly and now, little harm will be done. The speculators will lose their unearned paper profit, but that is about all."

Then this publication goes on to warn: "If we postpone correction until much more of the land has been sold and covered with buildings mortgaged at prices that cannot be sustained, the credit structure of the country will be deeply involved, as it was before 1932."

Since *House and Home* caters to the building trades it touches but lightly on speculation in farm lands, but gives some instances of how land sites in the cities have risen in price:

"In San Francisco, Big Builder Henry Doelger paid $580,000 for a tract that was offered for $15,000 in 1948; Peterson & Moretti are paying up to $10,000 a quarter acre lot for developed land on

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the old Mills estate that sold for $2,000 an acre in 1952.

"On Long Island, NAHB [National Association of Home Builders] Vice President Leonard Frank says builders are paying $16,000 and more for raw acreage they could have bought for $3,000 in 1950.

"In Miami, Builder Gene Fisher is paying $7,500 an acre for land he could have bought for $500 ten years ago.

"In South Jersey, NAHB Past President Carl Mitnick says the farmer who bought 60 acres and a house for $20,000 in 1948 has just turned down $360,000 for the land without the house. Mitnick himself had just sold another builder for $40,000 ten acres in Colwyck that cost him $3,000 fully developed in 1949.

"In the sagebrush east of El Paso, lots are selling for $795 that Arthur Rubloff bought in 1956 for $9 an acre.

"In the Twin Cities, MBA [Mortgage Bankers Association] Past President Weber Nelson closed out a land syndicate at 200% profit on the prices it paid in 1954.

"In Hawaii, apartment sites 50' x 100' near Waikiki Beach sell for $200,000, and land 15 miles from Honolulu that sold for $1,200 an acre before statehood is now selling for $20,000.

"Forty miles from downtown Los Angeles the Federal government got $19,000 an acre at auction for the Santa Ana Air Force Base it bought in 1942 for $350 to $5000 an acre."

And so it goes. Land prices have jumped all over the country. But, do these high prices represent a shortage of sites? Not at all. Land speculation hits the centers of population, or their perimeters, first; it is the more desirable city sites that are the primary objects of speculation. That pushes the prospective builder to the outside, where the price of land is still within the reach of consumers. The result is the uneconomic development of land far away from the centers of population, leaving belts of unused land in between. Aerial photographs of all our cities show "suburban sprawl"—the haphazard development of areas at some distance from the places of employment, causing the home owners unnecessary travel time and expense.

"Suburban sprawl," says *House and Home*, "is why Los Angeles home owners must drive 25 miles to Azuza while land much closer to downtown is being held off the market by land speculators who think they can sell it for ten times the 1950 price in 1970 instead of taking five times the 1950 price today."

What land speculation does is to create the illusion of scarcity. "Today's fancy prices can be kept high only as long as the illusion of scarcity can be preserved, as long as each buyer thinks the land he pays too much for today would cost more—and sell for more—tomorrow." That is, as long as the speculative psychology holds on. "But what will happen when the inevitable day comes when land prices can go no higher and speculators try to cash in on their paper profits? What will happen and who will get hurt when this land-price boom collapses—as every other land-price boom has collapsed?"

The publication then quotes from Professor Ernest M. Fisher's classic study of premature subdivisions: "It takes nearly 30 years to produce a new generation that has had to learn by pain and disappointment that while many fortunes have been made in real estate, many paupers likewise have arrived by the same route."

IN THE MEANTIME, before the crash, what is land speculation doing for the economy? "In the suburbs," says *House and Home*, "sky-high land prices are driving home builders further and further out to find land cheap enough to build on profitably. This further out land costs twice as much as land close in just a few years ago. It costs twice as much to connect with existing streets, sewers and utilities. It takes a much bigger slice of the home building dollar—19% today for far out lands vs 12% for close-in land in 1950. The high cost of getting home to this further-out land is a big factor in housing expense . . . and this in turn is driving many who would like new houses to move into apartments or stay where they are."

"In the cities," the story continues, "high land prices are the No. 1 reason private enterprise cannot build good new housing for middle-income families, high land prices are the No. 1 excuse for subsidized public housing, and high land prices are the No. 1 justification for asking taxpayers to subsidize slum clearance by buying out the slumlords at up to three times the re-use value of their land . . . .

"Since 1950 building material prices have climbed 24%, building trades wages have risen 60%, but land values for home building have soared anywhere from 100% to 3,760%."

Thus, land speculation tends to hold down the building of new houses, which, as everybody knows, is an indicator of the health of our economy. Every new house put up or started means orders for steel, lumber, cement, paint, a thousand and one items that go into the structure, which in turn means jobs for many workers in many industries. Land speculation is a barrier to the building of houses and therefore a block to progress. Every house not put up because of the cost of land is a loss to the economy.

To add insult to injury, the taxpayer, under our Federal housing program, is asked to help meet the price demanded by the land speculator. Where the government foots the bill for the construction of some housing project, it is the taxpayer who is required to dig down into his jeans for the price of the land. Where the government guarantees the mortgage, the tendency is for the bank to be more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generous in its appraisal of the value of the land on which it makes its loan; and since the government has nothing but its taxing power to support its guarantee of the mortgage, the effect is to make the taxpayer underwrite the speculative value of the land. There have been "scandals" exposed, showing how land speculators have boosted beyond all reason the value of the land on which government-guaranteed mortgages have been written and have pocketed the increase; but there is nothing that can be done about this practice under our land tenure system.

WELL, what can be done about land speculation? The answer, says *House and Home,* lies in the revision of our tax system. "Today's taxes often make it more profitable to misuse or under use land than to develop it and use it properly. They penalize land development, land improvement and home building by (1) multiplying the local taxes the owners must pay as soon as new buildings are built on his land or existing buildings are improved, and by (2) taxing away most of the profit from land development and home building at ordinary income tax rates. But they subsidize land speculation by (1) undertaxing the land as long as it is left idle or under used, and (2) taxing the profits of land speculation less than half as heavily as the profits of land development and home building are taxed."

Let us consider the subsidization of land speculation "as long as it is idle or under used." The price of land is based on its probable yield if it were rented. To explain this statement, let us make an analogy with the price of an industrial bond. All things else being equal, the price of the bond is determined by the capitalization of its yield. Thus, if the going rate of interest is 5%, and the bond pays $5 per year, it will probably sell for $100. If it pays $8 per year, and the going rate of interest is 5%, its price on the market will be about $150.

So it is with land. The value of a site is fixed by what it will yield in rent. Thus, if a piece of land on which a building rests rents for $1,000 a year (and assuming the going rate of interest is 5%), the land, without the building is worth $20,000. That is what the owner of a site, similarly situated, will ask for his land. The price of land is the capitalization of its rental value.

Now, a tax on land value is really a tax on the capitalization of its rental value. A tax on land value absorbs some of the possible yield. The land owner cannot capitalize what he does not get, what the tax collector gets. So, the selling price of his land is decreased by the amount of the tax on it. If all of this rental value were taxed away, then the selling price of his land would disappear; it would be worth nothing.

That is what *House and Home* means by the subsidization of land speculation: the low taxes imposed on land which is left idle or uneconomically used. Uneconomically used land is land which supports a slum or a building inconsistent with the value of the land, sometimes called a "taxpayer"; you know the land is uneconomically used when you see along side of it a big office building or a hotel. If the taxes on unused or economically unused land were raised to the level paid by land which has an adequate building on it, the owner would be forced to improve his land accordingly. He would be forced to improve his land because that is the only way with which to pay his land tax. He would have to get it out of the space he rented. If, in addition, taxes on improvements were lowered, that would be further inducement to build on his land. There would be more money in renting building space than in land speculation—if land were heavily taxed and buildings were untaxed or taxed at a lower rate.

Says Professor John Henry Denton, in charge of real estate studies at the University of Arizona: "The only cure for land speculation is to eliminate the extraordinarily favorable tax treatment accorded the land speculator. No justification for this can be found in economic theory. Unlike speculation in commodity futures or common stocks, land speculation does not support a market or provide a stimulus for production. In fact, it has just the opposite effect. It destroys the marketability of large areas of land by pricing them out of the reach of immediate users. It deprives our communities of many facilities for good living (such as parks and playground) by driving the land beyond what the communities can pay. It limits competition by holding a large part of the land supply off the current market. It channels capital funds from productive investment into sterile adventures and may be responsible for the present day dearth of private risk capital."

He might have added that land speculation does the economy no good.

REPRINTS

Of Earlier Chodorov Articles

Are Still Available

Van Doren, Payola and the Freudian Ethic	15c each
"Growth"—the Latest Socialistic Pitch	15c each
Khrushchev Had the Right Word	15c each
Senator Kennedy's "Right to Loaf" Bill	20c each
Bleeding the Railroads	15c each
Featherbedding: Robbery Made Legal	20c each
The "Depressed Areas" Bill: Another "Liberal" Patent Medicine	15c each

Reprints of the above articles can be ordered from

HUMAN EVENTS

410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One Reason We Have Slums

The Tax Structure Penalizes Upkeep of Property

By Raymond Moley

While the doctrines of Henry George and other tax reformers seem to have faded into the past and are largely forgotten in the calculations and teaching of economics, the new policies of urban renewal bring those ideas into sharp focus again. Henry George lived in a predominantly rural civilization, but his ideas have a permanent value and their reconsideration was never more necessary than today.

Embodied in that philosophy was the concept that since land on Fifth Avenue is physically no better than land fifty miles away in the wooded Hudson Valley, its greater sales worth must be due to the fact that many people are living in the city. Therefore, there attaches to prices a "social" value created by the community. And that value should be taxed to help support the public needs of the city.

Those who hold city real estate with little interest in its improvement are thus speculators who contribute little to the interests of the community. And if, as is necessary, there is to be urban renewal or redevelopment, the unearned increase in values should be squeezed from speculative profits. Thus it would be less necessary to tax not only those who have built improvements but the generality of taxpayers.

In a study just completed in New York City by a special committee on tax policies organized by the Citizens' Housing and Planning Council, some very interesting facts are developed.

The committee started with the self-evident fact that New York, just like all modern American cities, needs more and better housing for its people and that such housing should supplant slum properties. There should be action to create that housing. But the committee found that since the assessments and hence the tax burden on unimproved slum property are far lower than on improved property, the speculative values of such unimproved property have risen. It is a curious fact, then, that those who make improvements are punished. Government thus puts pressure on landowners not to do what the government wants done.

But to provide better housing and to improve the face of the city, state and Federal governments break through the situation by pouring our vast sums of money, largely Federal, to induce or to create improvements. So the government buys the land and sells it to the developer. The committee study found that the government paid $103,475,040 for twelve projects, but then sold the property to the developer for $22,721,303. The government pays 70 per cent above the values at which the same government has assessed the property. This low assessment on unimproved land means that to support the city, more must be raised on improved property. There is neither common sense nor justice in this.

For example, there are two pieces of real estate with a frontage of a block each on Fifth Avenue. They face each other and are of equal attractiveness. When, until recently, both had buildings dating back to the Nineteenth Century, the land under them was appraised at $5,000,000 each. But a private builder bought up one and built a tremendous office building. Nothing happened to the other. In the present appraisal, the man who built the office building has had his land assessed at $15,000,000, while the other side still pays on $5,000,000. Thus the man who built the big office building is penalized for doing something to improve the city, while the do-nothing owners pay the same as before.

A major remedy recommended by the committee is an overhauling of assessment policies. Also, to induce owners of undeveloped property to make improvements, it is suggested that such improvements should be exempt from taxation for a specified number of years.

A rational move of this kind would certainly lighten the immense burden on the Federal budget as well as promote the rebuilding of our cities.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ____ reprints of "LAND SPECULATION ENDANGERS THE ECONOMY" and "ONE REASON WE HAVE SLUMS" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

IF YOU LIKE THIS ARTICLE . . . . You should subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS, the weekly Washington Newsletter, reporting to 40,000 business and political leaders on politics, labor, taxes and business. HUMAN EVENTS will tell you each week the news behind the news from the Nation's Capital. TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: $1 for 5 weeks. One year: $12.50. YOUR MONEY BACK IF DISSATISFIED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN JUST 20 MINUTES...

You can do your Christmas shopping. Give HUMAN EVENTS. There is no truer compliment to an active, perceptive mind.

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 50 December 15, 1960 Section I — News

GOP: *Leaders mould strategy for the* '60's (625)

IKE: *"Red Carpet" for Jack bad politics* .... (625)

BELL: *Is new budget director a spender?* (626)

RIGHT TO WORK: *Unionism's losses tallied* (627)

NEW YORK: *Scandals hurt Democrats* ..... (628)

GOP Looks to '62: Amid much squabbling about who is the leader of the Republican party, with a view to the prospective candidate in 1964, Senator Barry Goldwater last week called on members of his party to stop worrying about '64 and, instead, to concentrate on victory in congressional elections in 1962. "The problem that faces the Republican party right now," he remarked in a statement to the Young Republicans in Tucson, "is not what will happen in 1964, but what will happen in 1962."

He went on to point out that 1960 is the first year since 1952 that the Republicans have gained seats in Congress, and he thinks they can continue this trend in 1962. This year they picked up 22 seats in the House and two in the Senate. The Arizona Senator said the grass-roots support of the GOP, which brought about these gains, disproves the argument of liberal pundits who have argued that the Republican party is a minority party.

Therefore, said Goldwater, "this is not the time to quibble over who holds the title of head of the party—as a matter of fact, the Republicans have always had too many chiefs and not enough Indians—but it is the time to capitalize on the tremendous demonstration of GOP voting strength and build our internal organization."

Capitol Hill, falling in with these thoughts, brushes off Senator Keating's suggestion of an extra-congressional national "advisory committee" of top-level Republicans to harmonize party differences and to steer national party policy. Keating suggested the following to serve on the group: Rockefeller, Goldwater, Eisenhower and Hoover. The experience of the Democrats with such an advisory body in the past two years has not been auspicious; it ran head on into the opposition of Democratic congressional leaders. The Keating notion therefore falls upon skeptical ears on the Hill.

Rather, the thinking among Republicans in Congress runs to letting party policy arise naturally from the members of Congress through their legislative leader and party committees. Last week, Representative Charles A. Halleck, House minority leader, after conferring with his lieutenants, said the shaping of GOP policy must start in Congress. "After all," he remarked, "we're going to have to do the voting." Instead of trying to raise large sums for the GOP National Committee, it is suggested, why not "beef up" the Republican Senatorial and Congressional Campaign Committees to enable them to win the House and sharply cut down the Democratic lead in the Senate in the elections of 1962?

It is recalled that, between the 1948 and 1952 Presidential elections, such grass-roots shaping of policy led to great gains in the 1950 off-year elections and to final victory in 1952. It was out of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, under Senator Brewster of Maine, that there arose the stirring statement of aims (reportedly written by famous writer Clarence Budington Kelland) that shaped Ike's campaign utterances (Ike, himself, acknowledged its value) in his victorious campaign of 1952. Some suggest that Brewster (now in retirement) and Kelland be drafted today to draw up a statement of principles for the party.

Alarums and Excursions: Maybe much of the public liked Ike's panoplied, red-carpet reception of Kennedy at the White House last week; perhaps they thought it a nice gesture on the part of the outgoing President, characteristic of his warm nature. The reaction of conservative Republicans on Capitol Hill, however, was one of real concern.

The real Republican pros did not like Ike's gesture because some newspapers seized on it as a sign that the GOP had abandoned the drive for the recounts of apparently fraudulent elections. Republican members from the Middle West tell HUMAN EVENTS *that they are going to fight the fraud in Cook County through to the bitter end, no matter how long it takes. "The war isn't over yet," seems to be the prevailing mood among congressional Republicans.*

As for the President's acceptance of the Kennedy offer to send Ike abroad on missions—Republican members of Congress say they want to know in more detail from the White House just exactly what this means. They fear that the then ex-President might become involved in some Democratic policy

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

move which would arouse the animated opposition of the Republican side of the aisle. GOP members of Congress will press for clearer illumination of this matter from the President. For the present, they take comfort in the general assurance from the White House that no Republicans of any importance will accept a high post with the Democratic regime. "We don't want any repetition of the Henry Stimson and Frank Knox business," they say—recalling now those two prominent Republicans accepted Cabinet posts under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Budget Buster Bell? Kennedy's appointment of the little-known David E. Bell as Budget Bureau chief sent shivers down conservative spines last week as Bell's political views began to emerge from press reports.

Secretary to Harvard's School of Public Administration and a teacher in its Economics Department —where Federal spending is considered a positive virtue—Bell looks very favorably upon Kennedy's "New Frontier."

Bell is convinced that the budget is a device for achieving "social ends, not simply sound dollars," as one press report put it. In contrast to present Budget Director Maurice Stans, Bell is expected to endorse almost every Federal agency's budget request and push for all legislation needed to enact Kennedy's program which, according to various estimates, will cost at least $17 billion more than the US is now spending.

Veteran Washington *Post* correspondent Jerry Kluttz says that Bell plans to pursue the same policies as those pursued by Roosevelt's wartime budget director, the late Harold Smith. Smith, who used his position to train such spenders as HEW's Arthur S. Flemming, employed every means at his command to milk money from Congress for the multifarious bureaus that cropped up during the war.

According to Kluttz, Smith "wouldn't hesitate to suggest an increase in the budget." In fact, Smith would actually prod Cabinet members into asking for more money than they felt was necessary.

Kluttz says Smith would ask Cabinet members if they really thought they could do the job with the amount of money they themselves had requested and then he would suggest: "Perhaps you'll need a substantial increase to do the job." Smith's costly budgets, of course, had to be financed through price and wage controls, rationing and deficit financing.

While this may be understandable during a war, Capitol Hill observers now fear that Kennedy may have to resort to some wartime measures—with strong Budget Bureau backing—to finance his legislative program. This line of reasoning does not seem far afield, either, when it is recalled that John Kenneth Galbraith, another Harvard adviser to the President-elect, has already urged the use of price and wage controls in his newest book. *The Liberal Hour.*

Ribicoff: Governor Abraham Ribicoff's appointment as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare was hailed even in some conservative quarters last week. But conservatives, who like the Governor for his ideas on a balanced budget, may have been somewhat hasty in cheering his selection by Kennedy.

Facts gathered from the Connecticut budget office by HUMAN EVENTS staffers establish the Governor to be a hearty endorser of welfare schemes and spending in general. In the last two years of Ribicoff's governorship—fiscal 1959-'61—his administration will have spent 40 per cent more than that spent by former Republican Governor John Lodge in the last two fiscal years of his reign, 1953-'55.

Moreover, Ribicoff's spending on health, education and welfare measures in fiscal 1959-'61 will reach a total of $339 million, $141 million more than that spent by Lodge on these very same measures during his last two years as Governor. This $339 million, according to Ribicoff's budget office, amounts to more money than Lodge's entire 1953-'55 budget.

Lady Senator-Liberal? GOP pros in the State of Maine expressed amazement at Washington dateline statements to the effect that Republican Senator Margaret Chase Smith's victory on November 8 was a liberal one. These statements are put out by the usual liberal pundits who today are seeking to fabricate a liberal facade for the Grand Old Party out of the election figures.

The pros in Maine see the November outcome quite otherwise. On only one issue—that of Federal contributions to the country's school teachers—did the lady-Senator toe the liberal line. On all others, her utterances on the hustings could well qualify for close adherence to the traditional brand of Maine conservatism. She called for a balanced budget, for an end to wild spending. She supported President Eisenhower's contention that his defense program had been adequate for the nation's security, and that no "new frontier" in arms spending was called for.

The white-haired Senator Smith snapped sassily back at the AFL-CIO and her union-supported opponent, who called her "an enemy of organized labor"; and she pointed with pride to her voting for the Landrum-Griffin bill—a measure which the Labor Bosses seek to cut to pieces in the coming session. Finally, she violated one of the main tenets of today's liberalism by calling for rising protecting tariffs—a stand which would curl the hair of those in the Capital who consider Senator Smith a liberal, if the pundits would let them know it.

With such a campaign policy, the senior Senator swept to victory and from the top of the ticket carried her GOP colleagues with her in a clean sweep in the election. Nothing liberal about that—in the eyes of Maine politicos who call the recent election outcome a "victory for conservatism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vote Frauds: While high marks are given to Illinois Republican leaders for their aggressive drive to expose vote frauds, little can be said for Attorney General Rogers, whose Department of Justice has not exactly starred in this matter.

Informed Chicago sources say that leading Illinois Republicans, well in advance of the election, foresaw that the Democrats controlling the polling machinery would try to "steal the election." These Republicans had, for some time, been delving into the antics of the Cook County ballot-stuffers, and wanted to forestall them. They drew up a plan for swearing in about 350 deputy US marshals to patrol the election places—arguing that such Federal government officials on the spot would by their very presence intimidate the hooligans from perpetrating their illegal acts. This plan was communicated to Attorney General Rogers, but that official of the Republican Administration declined to act.

Disgust over Rogers' inaction has grown since the election, as he has let it fall upon local Republicans to unbare the story of how Democratic Cook County machines tampered with the ballots and the voting apparatus. In this effort, GOP militants in the Windy City have become increasingly indignant that the Federal officials have failed to show much desire to protect the inviolability of the ballots. At one point in the developing Chicago "vote stealing" probe, the local Federal Attorney, Robert Tieken, was quoted as saying that he has "been refused permission to conduct a Federal grand jury inquiry at this time." Rogers was said to have given no reason for the refusal.

Interior Appointment: A new emphasis on public power projects can be expected with Kennedy's selection of Representative Stewart Udall (D.-Ariz.) to head the Interior Department. A Representative for six years, Udall has endorsed almost every major public power project proposed. An example of his public power thinking is reflected in two votes he cast in 1959.

He voted for H.R. 3460, which permitted a vast expansion of TVA with increased Federal subsidies, and he voted against an amendment to the bill which would have provided stronger budgetary and congressional controls over TVA financing and faster repayment of TVA's debt to the Federal government. The left-wing Americans for Democratic Action recorded Udall as voting "right" 100 per cent of the time on nine key issues in 1960, each one a spending measure. The AFL-CIO score sheet records Udall over a six-year period as having voted against the recommendations of its organization just one time.

Right-to-Work: Opponents of voluntary unionism suffered staggering defeats across the country in the November elections. The results came as a surprise to Labor Bosses who had predicted defeat for those supporting Right-to-Work. In a news release on election eve, the National Council for Industrial Peace, organized in the office of the chief lobbyist of the AFL-CIO in 1958, cited Right-to-Work as a major issue in seven states. It predicted "voter resentment" over Right-to-Work would elect Democratic governors, members of Congress and state legislatures in normally Republican states.

A significant example is found in Marion County, Indiana, which includes the state's largest city, Indianapolis. Union professionals made Right-to-Work a major issue in the campaign, vigorously supporting 12 state representatives who had supported compulsory unionism, at the same time opposing five representatives who had backed Right-to-Work.

All 12 union-supported legislators were defeated. Five Right-to-Work backers were returned to office.

In this state, where Right-to-Work was drawn clearly along party lines, the 79-21 Democratic majority in the legislature was replaced by a 66-34 Republican majority. Indiana Republicans also gained five Congressmen and swept virtually every state office except the governorship, losing that by only one percentage point. Other significant states where Right-to-Work was a key issue:

Utah: After Right-to-Work became a major issue, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate was soundly beaten by Governor George Clyde, a supporter of voluntary unionism. Right-to-Work supporters claim state legislature gains as well.

Kansas: Right-to-Work gained more than 15 legislative seats. In addition, Republicans swept state and national offices, unseating two Democratic Congressmen and a Democratic Governor.

New Mexico: A traditionally Democratic state turned out an incumbent Democratic Governor who endorsed compulsory unionism and elected Republican Ed Mechem, a former state legislator who sponsored a Right-to-Work bill in that body.

Delaware: Only here were no major gains recorded for Right-to-Work. The Governor elected is pledged to oppose Right-to-Work, but the legislature is free from domination by union lobbyists, according to reports from the state.

Vermont: Democratic gubernatorial candidate Russell Wiguette, a foe of Right-to-Work, was defeated and new gains for voluntary unionism were reported in the state legislature.

Oklahoma: This traditionally Democratic state sent two Republicans to Congress and gave Vice President Nixon a sizeable majority. Several Right-to-Work backers were added to the state legislature.

Virginia: In the wake of Senator Byrd's spotlighting of the Democratic plank to repeal Section 14b of Taft-Hartley (which enables states to pass Right-to-Work laws), national columnists attached

BOUND VOLUMES of HUMAN EVENTS for 1960—indexed—may now be ordered for March delivery. A special pre-publication price of $9.50 is offered until January 1, 1961. Regularly $18. This handsome volume will make a valuable addition to your library. Volumes for 1956, 1958 and 1959 are available at the regular price of $18.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considerable significance to the Presidential campaign. New York *Times* columnist Arthur Krock said that the outcome, in view of the emphasis on Right-to-Work, "might have positive effects on future labor legislation in the Federal area." Nixon, who supported the right of states to enact Right-to-Work laws, won Virginia by a decisive margin.

Capitol Camera: Republicans who supported Vice Presidential candidate Henry Cabot Lodge's campaign note with displeasure that he hasn't given at least moral support to those in the GOP who attempt to uncover Democratic election frauds and upset Kennedy's victory. Lodge said following the election that he was satisfied and proceeded on a quiet Caribbean vacation without further word. But it is recalled that it was none other than Lodge who engineered the pseudo-pious "stop thief" campaign against the seating of Taft delegates at the 1952 convention.

• *Some GOP election analysts now suggest that the Republicans pitch their woo in Presidential elections toward the Southern states rather than the big city minority blocs in the North. Despite GOP attempts to win minorities through an aggressive civil rights program, the minorities went for Kennedy.*

COPE, AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education, delivered 65 *per cent of the big-city vote for Kennedy in most Northern states, and in those states he ran ahead or approximately even with other Democratic candidates. If the GOP had steered itself toward starboard, instead of having struck a deal with Rockefeller in order to accommodate New York liberals, it is felt the party could have picked up enough additional Southern states to win.*

• Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who now has Kennedy's ear, is still calling for appeasement of the Red Chinese in the Far East. In Kansas City on December 1, according to the AP, Acheson said we should reduce Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist army and no longer consider Chiang's government as representative of the mainland. He also hinted that we should abandon the off-shore islands, and said he expected Red China to be admitted to the United Nations in a few years.

• *The conservative values stressed in the preface of Ike's National Goals Commission report are viewed as so much eyewash by students of the Commission's recommendations. The Commission actually calls for a vast increase in government spending. While the newspapers have built up the Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, as something of a conservative, Wriston's own statements contradict the image. He is a devout opponent of loyalty oaths, has denounced activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "nazism," condemned McCarthy's Communist investigations and favorably characterizes the report of his own Goal's Commission as "loaded with radical bombshells."*

The Shame of Our Cities: The conviction last week of Manhattan Borough President Hulan Jack (the Nation's highest elected Negro official) on charges of accepting money from a man seeking city favors has drawn attention to the many scandals that have plagued New York City in recent years—and also to the precarious position of Democratic Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr.

The Wagner administration has been the target of 21 major investigations since the son of the late Senator (who sponsored the Wagner labor act) took over City Hall seven years ago. This unprecedented number of city scandals has cost taxpayers untold millions in wasted and stolen revenues. Currently the departments of Education, Fire, Welfare, Markets, Police, Real Estate, Tax, Purchase, Water Supply and Gas and Electric are under investigation by district attorneys, the State Investigation Commission and the City Department of Investigation.

To keep pace with the growing scandals, City Investigations Commissioner Louis I. Kaplan has received an additional $150,000 to strengthen his staff. Wagner himself is not thought to be mixed up in the scandals, but his critics receive little argument when they charge the Mayor with being a political sissy who has added to the problem by not cracking down harder on corruption when it appears.

The New York City scandals, along with the renewed feud between the local liberal and regular Democrats which has torn the party apart, lend much hope to those who believe a fusion candidate could wrest control of City Hall from Wagner and the Democratic machine next November.

It is recalled that, following the 1932 Seabury investigation into New York City corruption, then Mayor Jimmy Walker resigned and went to Europe. In the next regular election, a fusion candidate, Fiorello LaGuardia, became mayor and the Democrats were without the enormous advantage of controlling City Hall, until William O'Dwyer took office in 1946.

Fusion ticket champions consider New York City Comptroller Lawrence Gerosa the best man to oppose Wagner next year. Gerosa has incurred the wrath of liberals because of his opposition to wasteful spending. Notable was the $500,000 1958 school bond issue, which was riddled with wasteful provisions, such as costly abstract mosaics to cover school walls. Gerosa's articulate opposition was given credit for defeating the boondoggle. It is thought that the highly respected Gerosa would stand the best chance of rallying the city's responsible elements to beat the Democratic ticket and end the Wagner mess.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR.
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER ALLAN H. RYSKIND
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER SVEND PETERSEN
Editorial Assistant: BARBARA STAMBAUGH *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
COMMENTARY

Conservatism: *If it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change.*

—FALKLAND

Vol. XVII, No. 50 — Section V

December 15, 1960

HEW Denies Children Have Duty to Parents

By Raymond Moley

An indeterminate number of conservative voters denied their support of Nixon because of his reputed closeness to Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This was because of the Secretary's indiscriminate employment and support of many individuals in the Office of Education and the Social Security Administration, with extremely radical and visionary notions about the meaning of welfare and the government's responsibility for obligations hitherto regarded as strictly within the province of the individual and the local community.

Proof of this secretarial naivete has now appeared in a booklet published by the Social Security Administration entitled, "Filial Responsibility in the Modern American family." It sells for 25 cents, and for that small sum children may get the latest fancy reasons why they owe nothing to their parents.

This publication holds the thesis that 35 states have been wrong in requiring children, able to do so, to contribute to the support of their needy parents.

The ideal of legislation is that it should embody the moral law generally regarded as binding on all civilized individuals. The legislation in those 35 states, it would seem, embodies one of the first principles of human life—the principle that the family is the basic unit of civilization.

The booklet just issued was prepared by one Alvin L. Schorr, a "family life specialist" in the Social Security Administration. His argument, which is buttressed by many of the writings of "do-gooders" in the vague fields of sociology, geriatrics, and social welfare, agrees in principle with the report of a Senate subcommittee which declared in substance that, because so many parents now live to an advanced age, they cannot be expected to remain "a part of their younger relatives' family."

This shocking conclusion, stated plainly, is that the older and more needy a parent, the less his children should regard him or her as a relative. I have had to read and reread this utter perversion of morality to believe that it was a responsible government which had issued it. And now comes Mr. Schorr, echoing the idea.

THE ORNERIEST CRITTER IN THE WHOLE RODEO

It should be said that when the Senate subcommittee made its report Senators Dirksen and Goldwater vehemently denounced it.

Sociological bureaucrats such as Schorr point out that it is not always easy to enforce through legislation the filial obligation upon children who refuse to assume it. Therefore, they believe it to be the easiest way to forget all about moral obligations and to tap what they conceive to be the illimitable revenues of the Federal government.

In this column I have on more than one occasion made the point that while the direct support of aged and needy parents may be difficult for children, it would be quite possible to provide a tax deduction for those who purchased health insurance for their parents. This would be one of several steps ignored in both the Kennedy proposals and the bill, now law, which was sponsored by the Administration in the last session of Congress. It would make the burden less for children growing up with families of their own, but still remind them of their moral obligation.

Father Richard Ginder's new book, *Right or Wrong, Series II*, is off the press. It consists of selected columns from his writings in *Our Sunday Visitor*, Huntington, Indiana, which published his book.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

US Civilians Abroad

By Westbrook Pegler

Not a moment too soon, President Eisenhower discovered that the cost of supporting families of American soldiers and civilian "attaches" abroad is a burden on the taxpayers which must be reduced. The return of the women and children of the army, including mothers-in-law with broken hips, will shake the large overseas military society which has been gradually established since VE Day. Most of these people are in West Germany and they always have been a military hazard. The social task of the army in separating them from the force will be far beyond the professional education of occidental military men. The Chinese temperament lends itself to easier solutions, for their useful adult females can slit throats and it is their ancient custom to throw surplus babies in rivers.

There is no sense in trying to be gruff and old-army about this. The service people were encouraged to regard themselves as wards, deserving support like reservation Indians, under a complex and ever-changing scheme of fringe benefits. This deprived them of some of their normal independence and they may now be compared to Puerto Ricans on relief in New York.

The civilians of the various "Administrations," both the husbands and their dependents, will be disheartened, too. But they are, after all, bureaucrats with the civil service mentality. Thus they will tot up their accrued home leave, sick leave, days off, overtime and severance to formidable sums.

It was a great mistake by the army to create this colony of camp followers. Single men in barracks don't grow into plaster saints, but domesticity was not the only alternative. We had bachelor services below the grade of sergeant on foreign stations many times before 1947, but now we impose effeminating distractions on an army which professed to be battle-ready in the field. There were 50,000 of these encumbrances ten years ago, all potential hostages and a hindrance in case of war.

The civilians' story is different. After VE Day the Washington squanderbund absorbed all the ex-reporters in the country for propaganda service abroad, augmenting thousands of inveterate hangers-on of the New Deal labyrinth. Their numbers and uselessness appalled observers from home arriving at the Rhine. Intelligent Germans recoiled from the manners, arrogance and extravagance of most of this non-military American invasion.

The PX system soon became a racket. Our people, including many civilians in private hire and even assigned newspaper correspondents, got quarters, food, gasoline, cigarettes, cameras, furniture and even the services of beauticians and barbers for a little more than a fourth of the normal retail prices. Black markets boomed. It was, so to speak, built-in. There was no other way to buy things.

Shep Stone, a distinguished junior editor of the New York *Times*, became a deputy to John McCloy, the high commissioner, known as the hicogalorum, who had a mansion in Bonn seized from a vanished Heinie, doubtless a Nazi beast. Stone was allotted eight German civilians as servants but insisted that he requisitioned only six and returned full measure by teaching them "democracy."

No newspaperman ever lived as high on the hog.

The *Times* had unofficial status as a private State Department. When Arthur Sulzberger, the owner and publisher, paid a visit to Bonn after the West German nation had been set up, he gave a reception for the new government. One of the other journalists impudently proposed that he convene a cabinet meeting.

Mr. Stone later bowed out and quietly reappeared in the Ford Foundation in California.

The State Department established the post of labor attache in each of our many embassies. They all had lavish prerequisites. Many of them were Communists. But when Spencer Miller, a new Assistant Secretary of State appointed by Eisenhower, tried to fire them, he was fired himself. Ever since then, this phase has been dominated by Dave Dubinsky and his own Secretary of State, Jay Lovestone, himself a onetime Red who claims, however, to have recanted. We also set up attaches for "culture" all over the world, many of them adherents of Eleanor Roosevelt; with the pay and perquisites of the labor attaches these foibles still exist at great expense.

The American Government built a compound to house the non-military employees and dependents at Bonn which the Germans promptly called the Golden Ghetto. The Germans were kept at bay and their children were barred from the American super-market shops where American kids taunted them charmingly with candy, ice cream and double-decker sandwiches.

The Bonn Government may take secret pleasure in refusing to contribute toward the redemption of an internal American debt thus incurred.

Something Went Wrong

Memorable facts? Do you remember what the network commentators were saying at 11 p.m. election night? Kennedy's lead was then more than 2 million popular votes; from 7:30 on, the proportion had remained constant at 52-48. The commentators predicted that the percentage would hold to the end. The electronic machine said the odds were about 335 to 1 on Kennedy. If the 52-48 ratio had held, Kennedy's plurality would be nearly 3 million—instead of 150,000—as at the moment this is written.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On Second Thought . . .

Whenever we discuss the prospects of democracy in one of the new nations of Africa or Asia, we analyze the rate of economic growth, the efficiency of the civil service, the loyalty of the armed forces, the number of schools per 10,000 children, etc. We never inquire whether the people display those particular dispositions of mind and character that make popular government workable.

—IRVING KRISTOL
In the British magazine *Encounter*.

Pioneers Had No 'Goals'

From the Wall Street Journal

If there's one thing that Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton had in common—and they didn't have everything in common when it came to political philosophy—it was a peculiar disinterest in setting forth America's national goals.

Here they were, two key leaders of the emerging nation that was but the fringe of an undeveloped continent, and yet, out of ignorance or worse, they failed to instruct the people on how the great, rich territory to the west could be tamed and used.

It is odd, when you think of it now, that historians have been so generous to these two—and you can include George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin and many others. After all, this was the late Eighteenth Century, the age of progress and enlightenment, not the medieval era of political reaction and stagnation.

So, without strong leadership, without adequate planning, without progressive minds in the fore, the little nation was left to drift. And drift it did. Merchants and artisans, uninstructed by Washington, went their muddled, profit-seeking way. And pioneers, unaware of national purpose and unsoothed by social security, piled themselves and their families into covered wagons and set out for the unknown.

Was that the way to make the most of the national inheritance? Was that the way, bereft of a national goals commission and dynamic planning, to meet the challenge of England and France and Spain, those European powers which dominated international trade and controlled most of the world's riches?

How much better it would have been had the Federal Government determined who would trek west to do what. How much better if the Government had alerted the people to the mercantile race, and provided the vigorous leadership the times demanded. Obviously Americans striving as individuals could not hope to conquer 2,500 miles of wilderness, much less produce the articles of commerce that would make the US equal and more to Europe's efficient systems.

Perhaps it is time we rewrote our history books. Perhaps it is time our forefathers were remembered for their failure to rally the people to the future's challenge.

Chicago Vote Frauds Recall K. C. Scandal

From the Chicago Tribune

The mysterious disappearance of records indicating fraud in the recent Chicago election recalls a similar incident on the night of May 27, 1947, when a safe was blown in the office of the Kansas City board of election commissioners. The safe blowers carried off the ballots that had been examined by the Jackson county grand jury in an investigation of election frauds.

The frauds were committed a year earlier in the primary election at which Representative Roger Slaughter was defeated for renomination in the 5th Missouri congressional district. Slaughter had incurred the displeasure of President Harry Truman, who ordered the Kansas City Democratic machine to support a little known candidate named Enos Axtell.

An investigation by the Kansas City *Star* showed that Axtell's victory was accomplished by wholesale frauds and in the following November he was defeated by a Republican, Albert L. Reeves, Jr., son of the federal judge who a few years earlier had sentenced many henchmen of the Pendergast political machine to prison for vote fraud conspiracy.

Tom Clark, now a judge of the United States Supreme court, was then attorney general of the United States, in command of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But Clark was a pal of President Truman, and the Justice Department made only perfunctory gestures toward an investigation. The United States district attorney announced that evidence was insufficient to justify action by the federal grand jury.

The Jackson county prosecuting attorney then put the county grand jury to work on the vote fraud charges. The jury indicted 71 persons and made a report charging that there had been a "deliberate, calculated, and premeditated plan to miscount the votes and otherwise steal the election."

The jury made its final report on May 27, after which the documentary evidence of fraud was returned to the office of the board of election commissioners. That night the evidence was stolen.

When the election machinery and the law enforcement agencies are in the hands of one political party, it is extremely difficult to press charges of election stealing against members of that party.

Oh?

From the Minneapolis Tribune

Our vote for the most impolitic remark among generally gracious acceptance and concession speeches will have to go to Robert Kennedy, brother of the President-elect . . . .

"Certainly the President will not debate someone who wants to be President," he told newsmen [in answer to a question about 1964].

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberals Train Guns on Senator Goldwater

From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette

Senator Barry Goldwater, along with those who believe he possesses at least average human intelligence, will need a big reservoir of self control in ensuing months.

The nation's pseudo-liberals are rallying their clan for his political destruction. Their strategy is abundantly clear: to convince America that Goldwater is a relic of the sociological Stone Age.

Time magazine has been working diligently on the theme for many weeks. It seldom mentions Goldwater without appending what it considers to be an uncomplimentary adjective—"ultraconservative" is the kindest of them.

Even the more moderate *Newsweek* magazine recently described New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller merely as "liberal," but in the same sentence called Goldwater ultraconservative and rich. Goldwater rich? Compared to Rockefeller?

It remained for the Washington *Post,* however, to roll the anti-Goldwater theme into one sticky ball in an editorial November 20.

The Washington *Post* is one of the Nation's most powerful voices for "liberalism." If Goldwater is "ultraconservative," then the Washington *Post* is "ultra-liberal," but without being as honest about its position as Goldwater is about his.

For ourselves, we are content to leave off the "ultra" in both cases. Let it suffice to say the Washington *Post* is "liberal" and doesn't like Goldwater's conservatism.

The way in which the dislike is expressed does the Washington *Post* no credit.

The paper says: ". . . Senator Goldwater, for one, represents not conservatism . . . but radicalism of the right. His perfectly honest aim is not to conserve present values, but to overturn what has been done; in domestic affairs he appears to want to return virtually to the Articles of the Confederation, and in foreign affairs he seemingly wishes to get tougher with the Soviet Union simultaneously with casting off the country's alliances . . ."

From this, one has no choice but to assume that the paper either has never listened to anything Senator Goldwater has said, or is not willing to present his actual position to its readers.

Also, one must assume that the Washington *Post's* unique definition of conservatism would make it a philosophy aimed at conserving socialism.

It is hard to believe that even the most self-centered "liberals" have so closed their eyes and ears to the other side's arguments that they can actually conceive Goldwater as the Washington *Post* describes him.

Goldwater has voted in the United States Senate for sensible measures to expand social security. He has said of Federal activities, "There is a difference between economically sound governmentally sponsored projects and . . . extravagant programs of subsidies and giveaways . . ."

He has said, also, that the proper avenue to peace is, "To establish our principles, speak out for justice, and to speak firmly, to state that we will discuss and negotiate with anyone—but that no one will trample down the freedoms of America, or the freedoms of America's allies, with force and might."

Further, on the same subject, he has said, "The ultimate objective of American policy is to help establish a world in which there is the largest possible measure of freedom and justice and peace and material prosperity . . ."

If there is no resemblance between the man The Washington *Post* describes and the man Goldwater is, the fault is not in the record, for Goldwater's record is clear to anyone, who wants to look at it.

COMMENTARY reprints available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. Please order by date of desired issue.

Justice Douglas Urges Red China Recognition

By Congressman H. R. Gross

Try again, Mr. Douglas. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who insists that Red China be admitted to the United Nations, is quoted in the Waterloo, Iowa, *Courier* as saying "how can an outlaw be kept outside the United Nations and yet disciplined by it?"

Before he goes any further, Douglas, one of the country's most loquacious "liberals," might tell us how well the United Nations has been able to discipline one of the world's worst outlaws, Communist Russia, which has been inside the United Nations for 15 years—ever since the ex-convict, Alger Hiss, produced the charter for that organization.

Surely, Douglas' memory is not so short that he has forgotten the massacres in Hungary and Poland and the war in Korea where 35,000 Americans died and another 100,000 were wounded. Red Russia was the main arsenal for all this bloody business, but if any effective disciplinary action was taken by the United Nations it is not of record.

Try again, Mr. Douglas. You still haven't made a case for the Chinese outlaws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED